



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/608,534

06/30/2003

Zeev Likwornik

Q73193

8254

23373 7590 04/28/2009
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

TIEU, BINH KIEN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2614

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/28/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/608,534	LIKWORNIK, ZEEV	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BINH K. TIEU	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 February 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19-38 and 40-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19-38 and 40-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albal et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0076934 *as cited in the previous Office Action*) in view of Tolopka (US. Pat. #: 6,757,360).

Regarding claim 1, Albal et al. (“Albal”) teaches a method for populating an electronic address book, said method comprising:

analyzing information stored in a billing database or call data record (see paragraph [0025]);

extracting at least one telephone number from the billing database or the call data record if at least some of the information stored in the billing database or call detail record meets predetermined criteria (paragraph [0027]); and

adding the extracted at least one telephone number to the electronic address book (see paragraphs [0029]-[0030]).

It should be noticed that Albal fails to clearly teach the feature of the predetermined criteria comprises a number of times the user receives a call from the at least one telephone

Art Unit: 2614

number within a certain time period. However, Tolopka teaches such feature in col.7, lines 46-67 for a purpose of logging or adding telephone numbers to one of "rejection" and "accept" telephone numbers lists.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of the predetermined criteria comprises a number of times the user receives a call from the at least one telephone number within a certain time period, as taught by Tolopka, into view of Albal in order to add telephone number(s) to the electronic address book.

Regarding claim 23, Albal teaches a system for populating an electronic address book comprising:

an analyzing unit which analyzes information stored in a billing database or call data record (see paragraph [0025]);

an extracting unit which extracts at least one telephone number from the billing database or the call data record if at least some of the information stored in the billing database or call detail record meets predetermined criteria (see paragraph [0027]); and

a transferring unit which adds the extracted at least one telephone number to the electronic address book (see paragraphs [0029]-[0030]).

It should be noticed that Albal fails to clearly teach the feature of the predetermined criteria comprises a number of times the user receives a call from the at least one telephone number within a certain time period. However, Tolopka teaches such feature in col.7, lines 46-67 for a purpose of logging or adding telephone numbers to one of "rejection" and "accept" telephone numbers lists.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of the predetermined criteria comprises a number of times the user receives a call from the at least one telephone number within a certain time period, as taught by Tolopka, into view of Albal in order to add telephone number(s) to the electronic address book.

3. Claims 1-2, 6-15, 20-24, 28-36, and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Comp (Pub. No.: US 2004/0203579) in view of Harms et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0078981 (*Both references were cited in the previous Office Action*) and Tolopka (US. Pat. #: 6,757,360).

Regarding claim 1, Comp teaches a method for populating an electronic address book, said method comprising:

analyzing information stored in a billing database or call data record (i.e., call log manager 52 and network billing database 50 as shown in figure 3, see paragraph [0019]);

extracting at least one telephone number from the billing database or the call data record if at least some of the information stored in the billing database or call detail record (see paragraph [0022] or [0025]); and

adding the extracted at least one telephone number to the electronic address book (see paragraph [0021]).

It should be noticed that Comp fails to clearly teach the feature of a predetermined criteria defined or selected by a user. However, Harms et al. (“Harms”) teaches features in paragraphs [0035]) for a purpose of selectively populating address information an address book.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of a predetermined criteria defined or selected by a user, as taught by Harms, into view of Comp in order to selectively populate address information an address book.

It should be further noticed that the combination of Comp and Harms fails to clearly teach the feature of the predetermined criteria comprises a number of times the user receives a call from the at least one telephone number within a certain time period. However, Tolopka teaches such feature in col.7, lines 46-67 for a purpose of logging or adding telephone numbers to one of "rejection" and "accept" telephone numbers lists.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of the predetermined criteria comprises a number of times the user receives a call from the at least one telephone number within a certain time period, as taught by Tolopka, into view of Comp and Harms in order to add telephone number(s) to the electronic address book.

Regarding claims 2-3, Comp further teaches limitations of the claims in paragraph [0025].

Regarding claims 6-12, Comp further teaches limitations of the claims in paragraphs [0019] and [0021].

Regarding claims 13-14, Comp and Harms teach the provisioning extracted contact information in a form of signal transmission and displaying the contact information to user. It is also known that other type of transmissions and presentation of contact information such as in a form of synthesized speech and SMS message, etc. are obviously implemented. Therefore, it

Art Unit: 2614

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a form of synthesized speech and SMS message in the well-known techniques into view of Comp and Harms in order to improve the provision of contact information to the user.

Regarding claim 15, Harms further teaches limitations of the claim in paragraphs [0035].

Regarding claims 20-22, Harms further teaches obviously limitations of the claims in col.7, lines 10-20.

Regarding claim 23, Comp teaches a system for populating an electronic address book, comprising:

an analyzing unit which analyzes information stored in a billing database or call data record (i.e., call log manager 52 and network billing database 50 as shown in figure 3, see paragraph [0019]);

an extracting unit which extracts at least one telephone number from the billing database or the call data record if at least some of the information stored in the billing database or call detail record (see paragraph [0022] or [0025]); and

a transferring unit which adds the extracted at least one telephone number to the electronic address book (see paragraph [0021]).

It should be noticed that Comp fails to clearly teach the feature of a predetermined criteria defined or selected by a user. However, Harms teaches features in paragraphs [0035] for a purpose of selectively populating address information an address book.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of a predetermined criteria defined or

Art Unit: 2614

selected by a user, as taught by Harms, into view of Comp in order to selectively populate address information an address book.

It should be further noticed that the combination of Comp and Harms fails to clearly teach the feature of the predetermined criteria comprises a number of times the user receives a call from the at least one telephone number within a certain time period. However, Tolopka teaches such feature in col.7, lines 46-67 for a purpose of logging or adding telephone numbers to one of "rejection" and "accept" telephone numbers lists.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of the predetermined criteria comprises a number of times the user receives a call from the at least one telephone number within a certain time period, as taught by Tolopka, into view of Comp and Harms in order to add telephone number(s) to the electronic address book.

Regarding claims 24-25, Comp further teaches limitations of the claims in paragraph [0025].

Regarding claims 28-34, Comp further teaches limitations of the claims in paragraphs [0019] and [0021].

Regarding claims 35-36, Comp and Harms teach the provisioning extracted contact information in a form of signal transmission and displaying the contact information to user. It is also known that other type of transmissions and presentation of contact information such as in a form of synthesized speech and SMS message, etc. are obviously implemented. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a form of synthesized speech and SMS message in the well-known

Art Unit: 2614

techniques into view of Comp and Harms in order to improve the provision of contact information to the user.

Regarding claims 41-43, Harms further teaches obviously limitations of the claims in col.7, lines 10-20.

4. Claims 4-5 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Comp (Pub. No.: US 2004/0203579) in view of Harms et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0078981) and Tolopka (US. Pat. #: 6,757,360) as applied to claims 1 and 23 above, and further in view of Sommerer (Pub. No.: US 2002/0143879 *also cited in the previous Office Action*).

Regarding claims 3-5, Comp, Harms and Tolopka, in combination, fails to clearly teach the features of assigning a nickname to a received contact information to be stored in a database for future use. However, Sommerer teaches such features in paragraphs [0031] for a purpose of quickly retrieving a destination address associated with the nickname for a communication session.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of assigning a nickname to a received contact information to be stored in a database for future use, as taught by Sommerer, into view of Comp, Harms and Tolopka in order to quickly retrieve a destination address associated with the nickname for a designed communication session.

5. Claims 16 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Comp (Pub. No.: US 2004/0203579) in view of Harms et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0078981) and Tolopka

Art Unit: 2614

(US. Pat. #: 6,757,360) as applied to claims 1 and 23 above, and further in view of Mansfield (Pub. No.: US 2003/0185365 *also cited in the previous Office Action*).

Regarding claims 16 and 37, Comp, Harms and Tolopka, in combination, fails to clearly teach the features of overwriting conflicts or old entries of contact information. However, Mansfield teaches such features in paragraph [0081] for a purpose of updating contact information in a phonebook.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of overwriting conflicts or old entries of contact information, as taught by Mansfield, into view of Comp, Harms and Tolopka in order to update contact information in the address book.

6. Claims 17, 19, 38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Comp (Pub. No.: US 2004/0203579) in view of Harms et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0078981) and Tolopka (US. Pat. #: 6,757,360) as applied to claims 1 and 23 above, and further in view of Yang (US Pat. #: 6,766,017 also cited in the previous Office Action).

Regarding claims 17 and 38, Comp, Harms and Tolopka, in combination, fails to clearly teach the features of dialing, a number of times, of a telephone number within a certain time period. However, Yang teaches such features in col.4, lines 45-65 for a purpose of updating memories of contact information on frequency of usage of respective telephone numbers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of dialing, a number of times, of a

Art Unit: 2614

telephone number within a certain time period, as taught by Yang, into view of Comp, Harms and Tolopka in order to update contact information in the address book.

Regarding claims 19 and 40, also accordance to the above cited reference in claim 17, Yang can be obviously modified so that the MPU 100 to be able to automatically determine the new number with short period of time which may be deleted, or not added to the lists in any memories.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17, 20-38 and 40-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Binh K. Tieu whose telephone number is (571) 272-7510 and E-mail address: BINH.TIEU@USPTO.GOV.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Curtis Kuntz, can be reached on (571) 272-7499 and **IF PAPER HAS BEEN MISSED FROM THIS OFFICIAL ACTION PACKAGE, PLEASE CALL CUSTOMER SERVICE FOR THE SUBSTITUTIONS OR COPIES.**

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

Hand Carry Deliveries to:

Customer Service Window
(Randolph Building)
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Art Unit: 2614

In formation regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the FAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/BINH K. TIEU/
Primary Examiner
Technology Division 2614

Date: April 2009